

REMARKS

In the April 17, 2006 Advisory Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 11-38 were allowed. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the April 17, 2006 Advisory Action, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-38 are pending, with claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 23, 30, and 31 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Advisory Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Laid-Open Patent Publication 2001-140928 (Fukushima). In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to define clearly the present invention over the prior art of record.

Claim 1

Applicant has amended claims 1 to recite a radially outer surface of the axially extending portion supports the flywheel in a radial direction. As seen in the Figures of Fukushima, the portion of the crankshaft 2 that attaches to the plate 33 of the flywheel is a radially inner surface and not an outer surface as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to recite that at least one of the axially extending portions is configured to support the damper mechanism in a radial direction by supporting a radially inner periphery of a plate of the damper mechanism. As seen in the Figures of Fukushima,

the portion of the crankshaft 2 that attaches to the plate 33 of the flywheel connects at a portion outside the inner periphery of the plate 33 and does not support the inner periphery as recited in claim 10 of the present application.

Clearly, the structures of aforementioned claims are *not* disclosed or suggested by Fukushima or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10 as now amended are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2-9 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 and 10, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1 and 10 neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter


On page 1 of the Advisory Action, claims 11-38 were allowed. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application.

* * *

Appl. No. 10/810,709
Amendment dated May 11, 2006
Reply to Advisory Action of April 17, 2006

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-38 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: 5/11/06

G:\04-APR06-NAT\ED-US020437 Amendment.doc